REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the present application. No claims have been added. No claims have been canceled. Therefore upon entry of the present Amendment, claims 1-20 will remain pending.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-2, 6, and 8-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al. (US Patent 6,747,977 B1) in view of Caves et al. (US Patent 6,788,691 B1). Applicants traverse these rejections.

The Examiner has rejected claims 3-5, 7, and 10-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combined system Smith - Caves in view of Rostoker et al. (US Patent 5,640,399 B1). Applicants traverse these rejections.

Claims 1–15 all have the limitation of multiple Direct Memory Access (DMA) units. Applicants have amended the claim to more particularly pointing out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention and to put the application in condition for allowance or appeal.

Applicants have continually and respectfully pointed out Examiner's error of misconstruing direct memory access. A direct memory access unit is not a buffer. Applicant is provided herewith excerpts from *NEWTON'S TELECOM DICTIONARY*, 16TH Edition, Applicant provides the definitions for both Direct Memory Access DMA and buffer for Examiners edification. Applicants respectfully request that the Appendix be made part of the record for possible appeal.

The Examiner has rejected claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al. (US Patent 6,747,977 B1) in view of Caves et al. (US Patent 6,788,691 B1). Applicants traverse this rejection.

The Examiner has rejected claims 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combined system Smith - Caves in view of Rostoker et al. (US Patent 5,640,399 B1). Applicants traverse these rejections.

Below is a reproduction of the rejection of claim 16:

In the claim 16, see figure 1, Smith et al. discloses ATM Adaptation Layer (AAL-2) is distinct from other ATM adaptation layers since it de-couples voice packets from ATM cell boundaries, and also since mini-packets from several calls can be multiplexeded[sic] into a single ATM connection. This multiplexed is asynchronous to the cell boundary and further effectively introduces a new switching layer above the ATM layer (see col. 3, lines 42-47); comprising:

- Fetching a voice packet from said DSP sub-system (figure 1, signal processor19), said voice packet including a physical phone line identifier corresponding toan originating voice channel supported by DSP sub-system (see col. 1, line 39-40, col. 1, line 60-67, col. 2, lines 61-62)

- A host processor (figure 1, codec 14).

The sections in Smith and Caves are structural and claim 16 is a method claim. It is difficult to formulate a response to the Examiner's rejection when he uses structure to reject method claims citing steps to be performed. In any event, Applicants have amended claim 16 to recite that the fetching is using Direct Memory Access (DMA) operations.

The art cited by the Examiner alone or in combination fails to teach or suggest the combination of claim 16:

A method for transmitting packetized data received from a digital signal processor (DSP) sub-system and a host processor in an asynchronous transfer mode (ATM) system, said method comprising:

fetching a voice packet from said DSP sub-system using a Direct Memory Access (DMA) operation, said voice packet including a physical phone line identifier corresponding to an originating voice channel supported by said DSP sub-system;

forwarding said voice packet to a transmit buffer associated with a identified transmit channel;

fetching a signaling and management packet from said host processor using a Direct Memory Access (DMA) operation, said signaling and management packet including a transmit channel identifier; and

forwarding said signaling and management packet to a transmit buffer associated with an identified transmit channel.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 8, and 16 on the ground of nonstatutory obiousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. patent No.: 6,961,340 B2 in view of Caves et al. Applicant traverses this rejection. However, in order to eliminate extra issues for appeal, Applicants are providing a Terminal Disclaimer to render this rejection moot.

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

While it is believed that the instant response places the application in condition for allowance, should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned in order to expeditiously resolve any outstanding issues.

Respectfully submitted:

/Steven A. Shaw/

_____   October 5, 2006

Steven A. Shaw   Date
Reg. No.: 39,368

Customer No.: 23494
TEXAS INSTRUMENTS INCORPORATED
P.O. Box 655474, M.S. 3999
Dallas, TX 75265
Telephone: (972) 917-5137
Facsimile: (972) 917-4418
email: steven-shaw@ti.com